



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/810,281	03/15/2001	John M. Hall	10004375-1	8897

7590 01/10/2005
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/810,281

Applicant(s)

HALL ET AL.

Examiner

Benjamin R Bruckart

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the corresponding address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2155

Detailed Action

Claims 1-21 are pending in this Office Action.

The 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection is withdrawn due to the examiners typographical error.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-10, 14-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11-13 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. See below.

Applicant's invention as claimed:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated over U.S. Patent No. 6,587,549 by Weik.

Art Unit: 2155

Regarding claim 18, a method of providing user-relative addressing in a computer network (Weik: col. 2, lines 7-18; lines 37-43), the method comprising:

receiving a communication including destination information (Weik: col. 2, lines 30-43) and sender identification information (Weik: col. 2, lines 37-54) the destination information including a first sender-relative destination (Weik: col. 2, lines 44- col. 3, line 3; destination information is sender-specific data);

determining whether the destination information specifies a sender-relative destination (Weik: col. 2, lines 44- col. 3, line 3; destination information is sender-specific information whether it be on the black or white list, these are relative to the sender information. If there not a match with the black list, the email is processed. If there is a positive match with the white list, the email may be forwarded to a special address);

accessing a sender record based on the received sender identification information (Weik: the black and white list are records of addresses that are compared with the sender-specific data);

providing action information identifying a plurality of actions associated with a plurality of sender-relative destinations (Weik: col. 2, lines 44- col. 3, line 3; black list= forwarded to address for scrap functions; white list forwarded for further processing);

identifying a first action in the action information based on the received destination information (Weik: col. 2, lines 44- col. 3, line 3; black list= forwarded to address for scrap functions; white list forwarded for further processing based on sender-specific data), the first action associated with the first sender-relative destination (Weik: col. 2, lines 44- 47; forward to);

identifying a first attribute in the sender record based on the first action and the received destination information (Weik: col. 2, lines 44-64; attribute is the match);

determining a first absolute destination based on the first attribute (Weik: col. 2, lines 44- col. 3, line 3; where it is forwarded to based on sender-specific data and match in white or black list record).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6, 14-15, 18-19, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 5,987,508 by Agraharam et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,549 by Weik.

Regarding claim 1,

The Agraharam reference teaches a method of providing user-relative addressing in a computer network environment (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 24-28), the method comprising:

associating a plurality of user-relative destinations with a corresponding plurality of actions (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 59-66; col. 4, lines 13-24);

receiving a first user-relative destination for a communication (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 52-56);

receiving user identification information (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 56-59);

identifying a first action in the plurality of actions associated with the first user-relative destination (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 59-66; col. 4, lines 13-24); and

determining a first absolute destination for the communication based on the first action and the user identification information (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 59-66; col. 4, lines 13-24; Figure 2).

The Agraharam reference does not explicitly state identifying the sender.

The Weik reference teaches identifying the sender (Weik: col. 2, lines 37-54).

The Weik reference further teaches the invention improves the handling of email to achieve a more effective control over message workflow (Weik: col. 1, lines 17-33).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of user relative addressing as taught by Agraharam while

Art Unit: 2155

identifying sender information as taught by Weik in order to improve the handling of email to achieve a more effective control over message workflow (Weik: col. 1, lines 17-33).

Claims 2-6 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Agraharam et al and Weik.

Regarding claim 2, the method of claim 1, wherein the network includes a directory server (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12), and wherein the determination of the first absolute destination is made by retrieving from the directory server the first absolute destination based on the first action and the user identification information (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 3, the method of claim 2, wherein the directory server is an LDAP server (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12).

Regarding claim 4, the method of claim 1, wherein the user identification information is an email address (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 55).

Regarding claim 5, the method of claim 1, wherein the user identification information is a user name (Agraharam: col. 5, lines 24-37; col. 3, lines 56-69; telephone number is like a username).

Regarding claim 6, the method of claim 1, wherein the first absolute destination is an email address (Agraharam: col. 3, line 66).

Regarding claim 14,

The Agraharam reference teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing a method of providing user-relative addressing in a computer network (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 24-28) comprising:

associating a plurality of user-relative destinations with a corresponding plurality of actions (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 59-66; col. 4, lines 13-24);

Art Unit: 2155

receiving a first user-relative destination for a communication (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 52-56);

receiving user identification information (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 56-59);

identifying a first action in the plurality of actions associated with the first user-relative destination (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 59-66; col. 4, lines 13-24); and

determining a first absolute destination for the communication based on the first action and the user identification information (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 59-66; col. 4, lines 13-24; Figure 2).

The Agraharam reference does not explicitly state identifying the sender.

The Weik reference teaches identifying the sender (Weik: col. 2, lines 37-54).

The Weik reference further teaches the invention improves the handling of email to achieve a more effective control over message workflow (Weik: col. 1, lines 17-33).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of user relative addressing as taught by Agraharam while identifying sender information as taught by Weik in order to improve the handling of email to achieve a more effective control over message workflow (Weik: col. 1, lines 17-33).

Claim 15 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Agraharam et al and Weik.

Regarding claim 15, the medium of claim 14, wherein the network includes a directory server (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12), and wherein the determination of the first absolute destination is made by retrieving from the directory server the first absolute destination based on the first action and the user identification information (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12).

Claims 7-10, 16, 17, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,987,508 by Agraharam et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,549 by Weik in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,589 by Takahashi.

Regarding claim 7,

Art Unit: 2155

The Agraharam and Weik references teaches the method of claim 1, of relative addressing in email.

The Agraharam and Weik references do not explicitly state forwarding to more than one email address.

The Takahashi reference teaches the destination is a plurality of email addresses (Takahashi: col. 7, lines 2-10; Figure 4).

The Takahashi reference further teaches the invention overcomes drawbacks of being away from the computer allowing users to customize selection of messages to be converted or forwarded to receive time sensitive email messages or documents (Takahashi: col. 2, lines 28- col. 3, line 30).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of user relative addressing as taught by Agraharam and Weik while forwarding to more than one email address as taught by Takahashi in order to help users receive time sensitive email messages or documents through the forwarding filter (Takahashi: col. 2, lines 28- col. 3, line 30).

Claims 8-10 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Agraharam et al, Weik, and Takahashi et al.

Regarding claim 8, the method of claim 1, wherein the first absolute destination is a fax phone number (Takahashi: col. 6, lines 65-67; Figure 4).

Regarding claim 9, the method of claim 1, wherein the first absolute destination is a plurality of fax phone numbers (Takahashi: col. 6, lines 65-67; Figure 4).

Regarding claim 10, the method of claim 1, and further comprising providing a mapping table that associates the plurality of user-relative destinations with the corresponding plurality of actions (Takahashi: col. 7, line 19- line 36; Figure 4).

Art Unit: 2155

Regarding claim 16,

The Agraharam and Weik references teach the medium of claim 14, relative addressing in email.

The Agraharam and Weik references do not explicitly state forwarding to a fax number.

The Takahashi reference teaches wherein the first absolute destination is a fax phone number (Takahashi: col. 6, lines 65-67; Figure 4).

The Takahashi reference further teaches the invention overcomes drawbacks of being away from the computer allowing users to customize selection of messages to be converted or forwarded to receive time sensitive email messages or documents (Takahashi: col. 2, lines 28-col. 3, line 30).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the medium of user relative addressing as taught by Agraharam and Weik while forwarding to a fax number as taught by Takahashi in order to help users receive time sensitive email messages or documents through the forwarding filter (Takahashi: col. 2, lines 28-col. 3, line 30).

Claim 17 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Agraharam et al, Weik, and Takahashi et al.

Regarding claim 17, the medium of claim 14, wherein the method further comprises providing a mapping table that associates the plurality of user-relative destinations with the corresponding plurality of actions (Takahashi: col. 7, line 19- line 36; Figure 4).

Claims 19, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,587,549 by Weik in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,508 by Agraharam et al.

Regarding claim 19,

The Weik reference teaches the method of claim 18 for providing user-relative addressing.

The Weik reference does not explicitly state a directory server.

Art Unit: 2155

The Agraharam reference teaches wherein the network includes a directory server (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12), and wherein a record is accessed from the directory server (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12), and wherein the determination of the first absolute destination is made by retrieving from the directory server the first absolute destination based on the first attribute (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12; col. 3, lines 59-66).

The Agraharam reference further teaches

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the method of user relative addressing as taught by Weik while using a directory server as taught by Agraharam in order store and retrieve necessary associated email address information (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 3-12).

Claim 21 is rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Agraharam et al and Weik.

Regarding claim 21, the method of claim 18, and further comprising:

accessing a plurality of employee records based on the first action (Agraharam: col. 4, lines 1-12; looking up the translation data);

comparing a first attribute in each employee record with the first attribute in the sender record (Agraharam: col. 3, lines 51-66; Weik: col. 2, lines 44- col. 3, line 3; Weik compares sender-specific data with the list and Agraharam teaches pulling data from a LDAP list);

identifying employee records with a first attribute that matches the first attribute of the sender's record (Weik: col. 2, lines 44-64);

determining a plurality of absolute destinations based on the identified employee records (Agraharam: col. 3, line 66; col. 4, lines 1-12; Weik: col. 2, lines 62- col. 3, line 3).

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,587,549 by Weik in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,442,589 by Takahashi.

Regarding claim 20,

The Weik reference teaches the method of claim 18, for user-relative addressing.

The Weik reference does not explicitly state a mapping table.

Art Unit: 2155

The Takahashi reference teaches a mapping table that associates the plurality of actions with the plurality of sender-relative destinations (Takahashi: col. 7, line 19- line 36; Figure 4).

The Takahashi reference further teaches the invention overcomes drawbacks of being away from the computer allowing users to customize selection of messages to be converted or forwarded to receive time sensitive email messages or documents (Takahashi: col. 2, lines 28- col. 3, line 30).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the medium of user relative addressing as taught by Weik while using a mapping table as taught by Takahashi in order to help users receive time sensitive email messages or documents through the forwarding filter (Takahashi: col. 2, lines 28- col. 3, line 30).

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,587,549 by Weik in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,438,583 by McDowell et al.

Regarding claim 11,

The Weik reference teaches a network device configured to be coupled to a computer network (Weik: Figure 1, tag 10), the network device comprising:

a receiver for receiving a communication (Weik: col. 1, lines 34-42; Figure 1, tag 1), the communication including destination information and sender identification information (Weik: col. 1, lines 36-52; col. 2, lines 37-43);

search information identifying searches associated with sender-relative destinations (Weik: col. 2, lines 20-25; lines 37-44); and

a controller coupled to the receiver, the controller configured to: identify whether the destination information specifies a sender-relative destination (Weik: col. 2, lines 37-44); perform at least one search based on the stored search information and the sender identification information if the destination information specifies a sender-relative destination (Weik: col. 2, lines 44-61); and identify at least one absolute destination based on the search (Weik: col. 2, lines 62-66).

The Weik reference does not explicitly state a directory server.

Art Unit: 2155

The McDowell reference teaches LDAP with a directory server (McDowell: col. 6, lines 12-18; Figure 12) and memory (McDowell: col. 16, lines 8-20) to find an absolute destination for the email to be forwarded to (McDowell: col. 3, lines 38-64).

The McDowell reference further teaches the invention overcomes lost email because of defunct email addresses by eliminating bouncing of inaccurately addressed emails with the forward file (McDowell: col. 1, lines 29-42).

Therefore it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to one of ordinary skill in the art to create the network device for searching sender information from a communication as taught by Weik while utilizing a directory server to forward the message as taught by McDowell in order to reduce lost and bounced email (McDowell: col. 1, lines 29-42).

Claims 12-13 are rejected under the same rationale given above. In the rejections set fourth, the examiner will address the additional limitations and point to the relevant teachings of Weik and McDowell et al.

Regarding claim 12, the network device of claim 11, wherein the memory stores a mapping table that includes the search information identifying searches associated with sender-relative destinations (Weik: col. 2, lines 44-61; McDowell: col. 4, lines 52-55).

Regarding claim 13, the network device of claim 11, wherein the memory stores an address resolving process (Weik: col. 2, lines 44-61), and wherein the controller is configured to identify the at least one absolute destination based on information in the stored mapping table and in the stored address resolving process (Weik: col. 2, lines 62-66; McDowell: col. 4, lines 52-55).

REMARKS

The Applicant Argues:

Art Unit: 2155

With regards to rejected claims 1-6, 14, 15, 18-19, 21; applicant argues Agraharam does not teach the original and amended portion “sender identifying information.”

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The rejection has been amended to address the argued limitation. The Agraharam reference does not detail sender identifying information but does teach user relative information, the user being disclosed relative to the destination information. The Weik reference teaches sender specific data as illustrated above in the revised rejection and argued below.

With regards to claims 11-13, applicant argues the Wiek reference does not teach or suggest identifying whether this sender-specific data specifies a sender-relative destination and searching a directory server

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The Wiek reference does teach identifying sender-relative destination. Weik col. 2, lines 31-43 teaches email is processed and designated or assigned. The assignment criteria relates to sender-specific data of the incoming email, particularly “name or email address of the sender.” Weik col. 2, lines 44- col. 3, line 3 teach and illustrate the processing of the email if the sender-specific data comparison with black and white lists are positive. If the black list comparison produces a positive match, an action is taken whether it be erased, stored, or **forwarded, to a special address.** (Emphasis Added). Similarly if a positive match is generated from the white list comparison, the email is passed on for further processing to be stored under, or **forwarded to, a special address** in parallel to the further processing of the email. (Emphasis Added).

Art Unit: 2155

Weik teaches the breadth and details of the claim with the comparison of sender-specific data to determine an address in which the email is addressed and forwarded to.

With regards to the Weik reference no teaching searching a directory server, the examiner has amended the 103 to better illustrate the combination. Although Weik does not teach the directory server, Weik does teach the control as admitted by applicant, and does teach the search by way of the comparison with the respective black and white lists.

Prior Art

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

U. S. Patent No. 6,658,456 issued to Shimoosawa et al teaches transferring email from the specific sender to a destination through a plurality of mediums.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin R Bruckart whose telephone number 571-272-3982. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:30 PM with every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2155

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-3982.

Benjamin R Bruckart
Examiner
Art Unit 2155

brb *BRB*
1/7/05

Hosain Alam
HOSAIN ALAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER